

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. F. FARNSWORTH,

OF ILLINOIS,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JUNE 15, 1864.

WASHINGTON, D. C. :

McGILL & WITHELLOW, PRINTERS AND STEREOTYPERS.

1864

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

S P E E C H.

The House having under consideration the Joint Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. FARNSWORTH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Before proceeding to discuss directly the question before the House, I wish to devote a few moments in replying to some remarks which fell from the lips of my colleague [Mr. Ross] last evening, and incidentally to remarks which have been uttered by other gentlemen since this debate commenced. I was surprised at the speech of my colleague last evening. In the whole course of a prepared speech of an hour's length, scarcely one word did he utter by way of rebuke of the rebels and traitors of the South. The entire burden of his speech, with a very small exception, from beginning to end was abuse of the Administration and of the Government, misrepresentation as to the manner in which the war had been conducted, and allegations against the Union men of the country that they had produced the war and were continuing it with a view to self-aggrandizement. It is true that he did for a very few moments, in a very mild and gingerly manner, take issue with Jeff. Davis and his crew upon the dogma of the right of States to secede from the Union under the Constitution; but it was done in a very deferential and careful and tender manner. To the balance of his speech it was like a grain of wheat hidden in a bushel of chaff; you may search for it all day, and when you find it it is not worth the seeking; or like Falstaff's bill at Mrs. Quickly's tavern, a penny-worth of bread to an enormous quantity of sack.

My colleague said that he and the party with which he acts are the friends of the soldier, that he himself introduced into the House a resolution to instruct the Committee on Military Affairs to increase the pay of officers and soldiers thirty-three per cent., but that instead of the committee reporting a bill to increase the pay of officers and soldiers of the Army

thirty-three per cent. they had only reported a bill to increase the pay of the soldiers ten cents a day, while at the same time they reduced his rations.

Now, what is the truth about this? A bill has been reported and has passed this House to increase the pay of soldiers from thirteen to sixteen dollars per month. It is true that that bill also provided for the repeal of part of the act of 1861, which act largely increased the rations of the soldier. And why? Because it was found that the soldier did not require these rations, and did not consume them. It was found that the rations provided by law for the soldiers in the field were sufficient to support a frugal family of a man, wife, and three children. The surplus rations were wasted, or their proceeds went into the pockets of commissaries and quartermasters. No soldier has complained of the reduction of his rations. I defy my colleague or any other gentleman on this floor to point to the case of a single soldier in the Army of the United States who complains of the loss.

True, my colleague did introduce a resolution, as he says, to increase the pay of officers and soldiers thirty-three per cent., but I think a few moments' examination of the votes of my colleague and the party with which he acts on other questions will not only convince the House and the country but the soldiers also, that those measures are not introduced by him from any friendly motive or feeling toward the soldier.

What has been the course of that gentleman and his party on this floor in regard to voting supplies to the Army? What has been their course in regard to raising money to pay the Army? His vote will be found recorded in almost every instance against the appropriation bills, against ways and means for raising money to pay the Army. It is only a week ago last Monday that a bill was introduced here to pun-

ish guerrillas, to punish those men who infect the woods and highways, playing *neutrals* when our Army comes along, and then prowling along the highways to shoot the wounded soldier who is dragging his weary footsteps to the rear to a hospital; and how did my colleague vote? Against the bill. First, there was a motion made to lay the bill on the table, and my colleague voted for that motion. On the passage of the bill, when the yeas and nays were again ordered, my colleague voted in the negative. And yet he is the friend of the soldier! I submit on this point an extract from the Globe of the proceedings of June 6:

"Mr. GARFIELD. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back bill of the House No. 429, to provide for the more speedy punishment of guerrillas, and for other purposes.

"The bill was read *in extenso*.

"Mr. ANCONA. How does that bill come in under this call?

"The SPEAKER. Under the call of States for resolutions bills may be introduced. That has been the uniform practice of the House.

"Mr. GARFIELD. I call for the previous question.

"Mr. LE BLOND. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

"The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order during the demand for the previous question.

"Mr. LE BLOND. Is a motion to refer to a standing committee in order?

"The SPEAKER. It is not now in order.

"Mr. LE BLOND. I move, then, that the bill be laid upon the table.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. I demand the yeas and nays.

"The yeas and nays were ordered.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. I withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays to see whether the previous question is seconded or not.

"The motion to lay upon the table was disagreed to.

"The House was then divided; and there were—ayes 60, noes 35.

"So the call for the previous question was seconded.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE moved that the bill be laid upon the table.

"Mr. BLAIR, of West Virginia, demanded the yeas and nays.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE demanded tellers on the yeas and nays.

"Tellers were ordered; and Messrs. ELDRIDGE, and COLE of California, were appointed.

"The House was divided; and the tellers reported—ayes thirty-five.

"So (more than one-fifth voting in favor thereof) the yeas and nays were ordered.

"The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 35, nays 67; as follows:

"YEAS—Messrs. James C. Allen, Ancona, Bliss, James S. Brown, Cox, Cravens, Dawson, Eden, Edgerton, Eldridge, Finck, Grider, Harrington, Charles M. Harris, Herriek, Hutchins, William Johnson, King, Le Blond, Long, Mallory, Marcy, McDowell, James R. Morris, Morrison, Noble, Pendleton, Perry, Robinson, Rogers, Ross, Scott, Chilton A. White, and Joseph W. White—35.

"NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Ames, Arnold, Ashley, Baily, John D. Baldwin, Beaman, Blaine, Jacob B. Blair, Broomall, Ambrose W. Clark, Cobb, Cole, Creswell, Thomas T. Davis, Dawes, Dixon, Donnelly, Driggs, Eliot, Farnsworth, Fenton, Frank, Garfield, Grinnell, Griswold, Hale, Hooper, Hotchkiss, Asahel W. Hubbard, John H. Hubbard, Ingersoll, Jenckes, Julian, Francis W. Kellogg, Orlando Kellogg, Littlejohn, Longyear, Marvin, Samuel F. Miller, Moorhead, Morrill, Daniel Morris, Amos Myers, Charles O'Neill, Orth, Patterson, Perham, Price, Alexander H. Rice, John H. Rice, Edward H. Rollins, Scofield, Shannon, Sloan, Smithers, Spalding, Thayer, Tracy, Upson, Elihu B. Washburne, William B. Washburn, Whaley, Wilder, Wilson, Windom, and Woodbridge—67.

"So the bill was not laid upon the table:

"The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered, which was on the passage of the bill.

"Mr. ALLEY called for the yeas and nays.

"The yeas and nays were ordered.

"The question was taken, and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 72, nays 37; as follows:

"YEAS—Messrs. Alley, Allison, Ames, Arnold, Ashley, Baily, John D. Baldwin, Beaman, Blaine, Jacob B. Blair, Broomall, Ambrose W. Clark, Cobb, Cole, Creswell, Dawes, Dixon, Donnelly, Driggs, Eliot, Farnsworth, Fenton, Frank, Garfield, Gooch, Grinnell, Griswold, Hale, Hooper, Hotchkiss, Asahel W. Hubbard, John H. Hubbard, Iluburd, Ingersoll, Jenckes, Julian, Kelley, Francis W. Kellogg, Orlando Kellogg, Littlejohn, Longyear, Marvin, McIndoe, Samuel F. Miller, Moorhead, Morrill, Daniel Morris, Amos Myers, Charles O'Neill, Orth, Patterson, Perham, Price, Alexander H. Rice, John H. Rice, Edward H. Rollins, Scofield, Shannon, Sloan, Smithers, Spalding, Thayer, Tracy, Upson, Elihu B. Washburne, William B. Washburn, Whaley, Williams, Wilder, Wilson, Windom, and Woodbridge—72.

"NAYS—Messrs. James C. Allen, Ancona, Augustus C. Baldwin, Bliss, Coffroth, Cravens, Henry Winter Davis, Dawson, Denison, Eden, Edgerton, Eldridge, Finck, Grider, Harding, Harrington, Charles M. Harris, Hutchins, King, Knapp, Le Blond, Long, Mallory, Marcy, McDowell, Morrison, Noble, Pendleton, Perry, Robinson, Rogers, Ross, Strouse, Voorhees, Wadsworth, Chilton A. White, and Joseph W. White—37.

"So the bill was passed."

On the subject of arming slaves, of putting negroes into the Army, how has my colleague and his party voted? Universally against it. They would strip from the backs of these black soldiers, now in the service of the country, their uniforms, and would send them back to slavery with chains and manacles. And yet they are the friends of the soldier!

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois is not discussing the question before the House.

The SPEAKER. The constitutional amendment opens a very wide range of debate. The gentleman's colleague [Mr. Ross] to whom he refers followed the same course of debate last evening, and it was tolerated.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois. My colleague [Mr. FARNSWORTH] is only replying to the speech of my other colleague [Mr. Ross] who spoke last night, and on whom no point of order was raised.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not attempted to confine gentlemen very closely in debate, for the proposition certainly opens up a very wide range.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust the point of order will not be pressed. But I trust he will not charge that the Democratic party has, by any declaration, favored the returning of slaves to rebel masters.

Mr. FARNSWORTH. On the vote to repeal the fugitive slave law how did that side of the House vote? Does not the fugitive slave law effect the black soldier in the Army who *was* a slave? That side of the House are in favor of continuing the fugitive slave law, and of disbanding colored troops. How did that side of the House vote on the question of arming slaves and paying them as soldiers? They voted against it. They are in favor of disbanding the colored regiments, and, armed with the fugitive slave law, sending the men back to their masters. I do not charge this on the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN.] I think he does not vote invariably

with his party. He has too much sense and too good a heart for that.

Another objection to this proposition, made by my colleague, [Mr. Ross.] and also by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. FERNANDO WOOD] and by the other gentleman from New York, [Mr. PRYOR,] is that it strikes at property; that it interferes with the vested rights of the people of States in property. What constitutes property? I know it is said by some gentlemen on the other side that what the statute makes property is property. I deny it. What vested right has any man or State in property in man? We of the North hold property, not by virtue of statute law, not by virtue of enactments. Our property consists in lands, in chattels, in *things*. Our property was made property by Jehovah when He gave man dominion over it. But nowhere did He give dominion to man over another man. Our title extends back to the foundation of the world. That constitutes property. There is where we get our title. There is where we get our "vested rights" to property.

In these points are summed up pretty much all the arguments made on the other side of this House against the passage of this bill, and I will occupy no more time in answering them.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the organization of this Government there were about fifty thousand slaves within the limits of the United States. When our fathers rose out of the clouds of the Revolution and formed this Constitution, which I trust we are about to amend, no one of them dreamed that slavery in this land would continue until this time.

This fact may be gathered from the writings of the men who wrote and from the speeches of the men who spoke in that day. Why, sir, immediately after the Revolution, Congress issued an address to the people in which occur these memorable words:

"Let it be remembered, finally, that it has ever been the boast and pride of America that the rights for which she contended are the RIGHTS OF HUMAN NATURE."

This language was deliberately adopted and addressed to the people of the United States. This was after the Declaration of Independence, wherein they had declared as self-evident facts that all men were created equal, and endowed with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And when they followed this by the adoption of the Constitution the greatest care was taken that no words should be incorporated into that instrument which would imply that "man could hold property in man." I use the very language of James Madison, a member of the Convention which framed the Constitution. He objected to incorporating the word "slave" or "slavery" into the Constitution, for the reason, as he said, that he would have nothing put into it which would recognize the right of

a man to hold property in man. And you may search through the Constitution from the beginning to the conclusion of it, and no stranger to the fact that slavery has existed in the United States would believe for a moment that slavery could exist under it.

Let that Constitution go before a court which is a stranger to the fact that slavery has existed here, and let it be construed as courts are required to construe written instruments, by itself, without looking to the facts of contemporaneous history, and no judge thus construing the Constitution would say that slavery could exist under it.

Our fathers were thus careful in framing the Constitution so that when slavery should be entirely abolished, and when their posterity should come to look in there, they could find nothing to mar its beautiful symmetry. That was the object, that when future generations came to look at that sacred instrument they should not find anything in it to indicate or imply that slavery ever existed in this land. Why, sir, they believed that slavery was going to die out speedily. Already steps had been taken in several of the States toward the abolition of slavery, and several of the States abolished it soon afterwards. There were, as I said before, but fifty thousand slaves in the Union. The raising of slaves for market was unprofitable. The old fathers who made the Constitution, the men who fought the battles of the Revolution, fought for the rights of *human nature*, and they believed that slavery was at war with the rights of *human nature*. Of course such men, who had just gone through the fires of a seven years' war for those principles, and who framed the Constitution upon such a base, believed that slavery would die, and that speedily. Mr. Jefferson, in his Notes on Virginia, says:

"In the very first session held under the republican Government the Assembly [of Virginia] passed a law for the perpetual prohibition of the importation of slaves. This will in some measure stop the increase of this great *political and moral evil*, while the minds of our citizens may be ripening for a COMPLETE EMANCIPATION OF HUMAN NATURE."

Why, sir, it has been said by gentlemen over the way, if not now I have heard the sentiment uttered before on that side of the House, and by men of that party, that the "human nature" referred to in that address of Congress was not meant to apply to black human nature; that that only meant white men, Anglo-Saxons—Anglo-Saxon *human nature*! But Mr. Jefferson declares that the abolishing of the importation of *slaves* may prepare the way for the "speedy emancipation of human nature." That shows what was meant and how those words were understood and used by the good old Democrats of the Revolution. They included every son and daughter of Adam, whether born under a tropical or a frigid sky. One of the first things they did was to prohibit slavery in *all* the territory belonging to the

ited States. They said, "We will see to it that this great curse shall spread no further." Why, sir, this shows the hearts and heads of our forefathers were imbued with the spirit of freedom, emancipation — abolition, if you please. In the very first Congress under the Constitution of the United States a petition was presented to it by Benjamin Franklin, as the president of an abolition society of Philadelphia, praying Congress to go to the very verge of the authority vested in them for the abolition of slavery.

I refer to these things for the purpose of showing the doctrine which prevailed in that day, "in the early and better days of the Republic." But, sir, alas! it happened we took our departure from these landmarks. Men became greedy and avaricious. The invention of the cotton-gin, the culture of cotton made it profitable to raise men and women for the southern market. The price of slaves was enhanced; from being worth \$250 they went up to \$1,200 and \$1,300. Then the greed for power took possession of the slaveholders, and the avarice of these men overleaped itself, and they became clamorous for the extension of slavery. The bounds were too narrow for them. They became ambitious of a nation that should be founded upon the "corner-stone of slavery."

Then it was, Mr. Speaker, that the slave power got the control of the Government; of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments. Then it was that they got possession of the high places of society. They took possession of the churches. They took possession of the land. Then it became criminal for a man to open his lips in denunciation of the evil and sin of slaveholding. Then followed those scenes of riot and bloodshed in the North, the dragging of Garrison through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck to be hanged; the issuing of a message by the Governor of Massachusetts, Edward Everett, declaring that the men agitating the slavery question were indictable at common law; the indictment in southern States of men in the North for anti-slavery publications in the city of New York. Then came requisitions upon the Governors of the North to surrender the bodies of these men to be taken South to be tried; the offering rewards for the heads of northern men; the murder of Lovejoy at Alton; the thrusting of that old patriot, Joshua R. Giddings, out of Congress; the attempt to expel John Quincy Adams; the throttling of the right of petition; suppressing the freedom of the press; the suppression of the freedom of the mails; all these things followed the taking possession of the Government by the slave power, until we were the slaves of slaves, being chained to the car of this slave Juggernaut. Both the great political parties of the country wore its yoke and were

prostrate before its power. But, thank God, there were men in the land who stood shoulder to shoulder and declared that they would not be slaves, that they would still make their voice and action felt. The better sense of the people began to revolt against the continued aggressions of this monster. Agitation continued, agitation simply to bring back the country to the landmarks of the fathers, to make this what it professed to be, a *republican Government*, to maintain the rights of "human nature," for which our fathers had declared they had fought.

Then came the conventions of the rival political parties, in which they declared that the agitation of this vexed question should cease. But it would not cease, for the slave power was still clamoring for *more, more, more!* Then came the decision of the Supreme Court. Why, sir, the spirit of slavery took possession of that court and instigated the palsied arm of a judge upon the brink of the grave to attempt to snatch the charter of human liberty from the throne of the Almighty!

I need not go further with the history of this subject. We all know how it culminated. When we stood in the breach and declared that slavery should go no further, that it should not spread over the land, that they should not "call the roll of their slaves under the shadow of Bunker Hill!" nor "flog them in the corn-fields of Illinois," then the slaveholders brought on the rebellion. Yet strange as it is, men from the free North still cling to the carcass of slavery, and try to galvanize it into new life, and say to it, "Thou shalt not surely die!" Although this is an old subject to many, yet I desire for a few moments to call the attention of the House to the comparative benefits and evils of free and slave institutions, as they are practicably illustrated by the census reports. I wish to read from a speech I had the honor to make in this House six years ago the present Congress. I then said:

"Virginia has something over sixty thousand square miles of territory, while New York has some forty-seven thousand square miles. Virginia has as good a soil, and a better climate than New York—and had much the start in settlement! I have prepared a table which I will give, showing the progress of the two States up to 1850:

Total population at different periods, including slaves.

| | 1790. | 1800. | 1830. | 1850. |
|---------------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Virginia..... | 748,308 | 880,260 | 1,211,405 | 1,421,631 |
| New York..... | 340,120 | 586,756 | 1,918,608 | 3,037,394 |

"Again, sir; in 1850 there were invested in church property in New York \$21,134,207, and in Virginia the sum of only \$2,856,076. At that time there were published in New York 428 newspapers, with an aggregate circulation of 115,385,473; while in Virginia there were but 87, with a circulation of 9,223,068. New York expends \$2,500,000 yearly for educational purposes, while Virginia expends about \$700,000. In Virginia, taking the entire free white native population, there are 75,868 adults over twenty years of age who cannot read or write, while in New York there are but 23,241 of the same class. In New York it is about one in fifty of the adults, while in Virginia it is about one in five! Sixty years ago Virginia ranked as the noblest and richest State of them all; she was then justly regarded as the mother of statesmen and

of States: then she had ten Representatives, while New York had only six. Now New York has thirty-three, and Virginia thirteen. Why, sir, John Randolph said a good many years ago, 'Virginia is so impoverished by the system of slavery, that the tables will sooner or later be turned, and the slaves will advertise for runaway masters.'

"Take another example; Kentucky and Ohio, nearly equal in area, Kentucky having the advantage in climate; and in all other respects as to soil, position, and natural resources equal to Ohio; and how do they stand in the race of progress? Kentucky had much the start, having, in 1790, 73,000 inhabitants, while Ohio had none. Kentucky was admitted into the Union by act of Congress of February, 1791. Ohio was admitted in 1803, with one Representative. In the year 1800, Kentucky had 221,000 inhabitants, and Ohio had only 45,365. In 1820 Kentucky had 561,000, while Ohio had 581,000! And in 1850 Kentucky had 982,605, while Ohio had 1,980,329! It will be borne in mind that this enumeration in Kentucky includes over 210,000 slaves, while in Ohio they are all freemen.

"In 1850 Kentucky had 62 newspapers, with a circulation of 6,882,538; and Ohio had 261 newspapers, with a circulation of 50,473,407. Kentucky had 131,205 pupils and students attending schools, and Ohio had 514,809 attending schools. Kentucky has now 10 Representatives, and Ohio 21; and after 1860 the disparity will be much greater. Upon the adoption of the Federal Constitution, I think South Carolina had five Representatives. In seventy years this State, which, if we are to believe her states men, has such an excellent social and political system, and such a pure and genuine democracy, has managed, principally by the increase of her slaves, (who now number more than half her entire population,) to grow just one Representative.

"Take one other example, Mr. Speaker, and I have done with the subject—Alabama, the most flourishing of all the slave States. In 1820 she had 127,900 inhabitants; while Illinois, at the same time, had but 55,000. They were admitted into the Union about the same time. I think Illinois was admitted in December, 1818, and Alabama in December, 1819. Well, there they are, fairly started in the race of progress. Alabama having more than twice as many people as Illinois, situate directly upon the Gulf of Mexico, with the harbor of Mobile, capable of accommodating almost the entire shipping of the world; her products of a much more valuable character than those of Illinois; while Illinois was a far western State, difficult of access, far away from the sea-coast and from an inviting market. Now, sir, let us see 'what time they have made' in the race, and how they come out.

Population.

| | 1820. | 1830. | 1840. | 1850. |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Alabama..... | 127,000 | 309,527 | 590,756 | 771,623 |
| Illinois..... | 55,200 | 157,445 | 476,183 | 851,470 |

"This includes slaves and all. The white population of Alabama in 1850 was only 426,514; and to-day, sir, while Illinois has more than a million and a half of freemen, there are not probably more than half a million in Alabama. In Alabama, in 1850, there were 60 newspapers, with an aggregate circulation of 2,662,741; and in Illinois there were 107 newspapers, with a circulation of 5,102,276. In Alabama there were 62,846 pupils and students attending schools, &c.; and in Illinois there were, at the same time, 182,292 attending schools."

| | |
|---|-----------|
| In 1860 the population of Virginia was..... | 1,596,318 |
| New York..... | 3,880,735 |
| Increase from 1850 to 1860 in Virginia about..... | 100,000 |
| New York about..... | 800,000 |

This includes 490,000 slaves in Virginia.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| In 1860 the population of Alabama was..... | 964,201 |
| Illinois..... | 1,711,951 |
| Increase from 1850 to 1860 in Alabama..... | 200,000 |
| Illinois..... | 300,000 |

This includes 435,080 slaves in Alabama.

What an astounding picture is this! Kentucky has as good a soil, a better climate, more valuable productions, a larger area of territory, and with seventy thousand inhabitants before Ohio had any; and yet when they started upon the race how steadily Ohio gained upon and overtook her competitor, and marched onward and upward in the race of progress.

I made a calculation in reference to the comparative influences of free and slave institutions upon public intelligence:

"In Massachusetts, in 1850, there were but one thousand and fifty-five native white persons over the age of twenty years who could not read and write; or about one to every seven hundred and seventy-eight of the entire white native population. At the same time there were of the same class in Alabama thirty-three thousand six hundred and eighteen who could not read and write, or one to every twelve and a half of the entire white native population; and that is about the average in the slave States. Why, sir, in the slaveholding States to-day, from eighteen to twenty per cent. of all the free white native voters cannot read the ballots they cast, nor sign their own names to a poll-book."

My friend near me asks if these men, who cannot read and write, do not vote the Democratic ticket. I can only say that they generally do in my State. Now, sir, we see that the effects of slavery are baneful, that it is in every conceivable form a curse to the soil, to the people, to intelligence, and to industry; a curse to white men and to black men; that it cripples and palsies; that wherever its sirocco breath floats over a territory it poisons the stream of prosperity and intelligence; and that where the spirit of liberty breathes upon a State it rises like a giant and becomes great, prosperous, and powerful. And yet gentlemen will cling to this old carcass of human slavery. *They will not let it go.*

I thank God that the Republic has at last recognized the manhood of the negro. Gentlemen may call us "miscegenists," and they may talk of equal rights. I do not know of any man in the party to which I belong who is fearful of coming into competition with the negro. I know there are many men of the party of my colleague who spoke last evening, [Mr. Ross,] who do feel that the negro is their natural competitor and rival, and they do fear, and fear with some reason, too, that the negroes will outstrip them if we give them a fair chance. I have heard gentlemen talk about their fears that negroes might become Representatives upon this floor. Well, I am inclined to think that the country would not suffer by such a change in some instances. Oh! they are afraid of "negro equality" and "miscegenation." You must not unchain the slave and allow him the fruits of his own toil and permit him to fight for the Republic for fear of *negro equality and miscegenation*. Can the head or heart of man conceive of anything more mean and despicable?

The slave owner is cutting at the heart of the nation; yea, sir, he is cutting at the throats of your sons and brothers, of your neighbors and friends; he is with mad desperation seeking to destroy the beautiful fabric of this nation, and to quench in our blood the fires of republican liberty which have burned so long, a beacon light to other nations, and the hope of the world. All this he is trying to do that he may erect a slave empire instead; and yet men who falsely call themselves *patriots* and *Union men* are unwilling to let slavery go.

Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of "*miscegenation*." If my colleague over the way is afraid of it, if he requires the restraining influences of a penal statute to keep him and his party from running into miscegenation, I will willingly vote it to them. But we do not want it; we do not practice miscegenation; we do not belong to that school; that is a Democratic institution; that goes hand in hand with slavery. Why, sir, some of the very best blood of the Democracy of Virginia may be found in the contraband village at Arlington to day; the blood of the Masons, the Hunters, the Garnetts, the Carters, and the Haxalls; their lineal though natural descendants are among the contrabands.

I said I thank God that this nation at last has recognized the manhood of the negro. It did that when it put on him the uniform of a soldier of the Republic, and put him into the field to defend the country. His rights and his manhood were recognized, and nobly does he vindicate himself. Sir, I know something of the good faith, of the reliability and nobility of the negroes, and of the faithfulness with which they assist us. The very first information that the army of McClellan had of the approach of Jackson from the Shenandoah toward Mechanicsville was given by a contraband who came in to my lines a little above Atlee's station. When I had examined him I sent him to headquarters, with a note stating that he possessed and had given me valuable information. Porter sent him back to me with directions to send him through my lines again for more information. That very night he passed through the picket lines of the enemy, and in twenty-four hours returned with information of the exact position of Jackson and his army, and of his designs. And yet, according to the doctrine of my colleague, I should have put chains and manacles on that man, and with stripes sent him back to his master. What right had he there? Set at him the bloodhounds of the fugitive-slave law; "the CONSTITUTION guarantees slavery; you are agitating the rebels and making them worse." *Irritating* them; yes, sir, that is the expression. I *irritated* that

man's master by not sending him back. Was not that man more valuable to the Government than Jeff. Davis and his whole crew ever were? Was he not better entitled to respect from the white men of this nation than any man now in the rebel ranks, or who sympathizes with them, no matter what his position or wealth?

Mr. ROSS. I desire to ask the gentleman whether he thinks the white man is equal to the negro.

Mr. FARNSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, that is a silly question which it is useless to answer. I think some white men are better than some other white men. I think some white men are better than some negroes, and that some negroes are better than some white men, especially those of the copperhead persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, upon every battle-field where the black troops have had any chance to show their gallantry and bravery, they have vindicated the high estimation which has been placed upon them and the confidence imposed in them in elevating them to the position of soldiers. I know it used to be said when the idea of arming the blacks was first broached that white soldiers would not fight by the side of black men. Go to the Army to-day and witness the charge of a black brigade, and then come back and tell me whether the white soldier is not willing that the black man shall fight by his side. Witness the shouts and plaudits and cheers which ring out from the throats of the white soldiers as the black men march steadily up to the serrried lines of the rebels, and then come back and tell me if the white man is not willing that the black man shall help him to fight the battles of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of finishing this business *entirely and finally now*. No child is so simple as not to know that slavery is the cause of this war; that it is the source of all our woe. Then why not finish it? It has spread the land with weeds and mourning. It has hung the very heavens with black. It has disgraced and dishonored us long enough with the other nations of the earth, and God is now chastising us for the sin.